

MR. REID'S ACCEPTANCE.

HE REVIEWS THE POLITICAL SITUATION.

THE VITAL ISSUES, HE SAYS, ARE THOSE RELATING TO THE TARIFF AND THE CURRENCY.

The letter of Whitelaw Reid to the Chairman of the Committee instructed by the Minneapolis

converted to advise him of his nomination to Vice-President of the United States was given out for publication last night. It is as follows:

Hon. W. T. Durbin, Anderson, Ind.

Dear Sir: When the nomination with which the National Convention had honored me was formally announced by your committee, I accepted it at once. In doing so I accepted also the principles set forth in the resolutions adopted by the Convention as the basis of its appeal to the popular suffrage.

To do other or less than this is, to any honorable man, an impossibility. A political party is an association of citizens seeking to have the Government conducted in accordance with its principles and sentiments. It is the duty of every citizen to elect for that purpose. To accept the nomination without intending to carry out its principles would be as dishonorable and as criminal as to procure goods under false pretences.

There will be no misunderstanding as to the nature

poses of the Republican party in this contest, and no doubt as to the attitude of its candidates. What it intends it has set forth in language that cannot be mistaken: and they will strive, by all the lawful means in their power, to enforce its plainly expressed will. Since my interview with your committee, further reflection and careful attention to the arguments on both sides in the public discussion have confirmed my belief in the wisdom of the Republican declaration, as well as in the lucid candor with which they have been presented.

The party platform—so-called—are more important this year than usual. Both the leading candidates have once commanded the approval of the American people in its highest form of expression. Attention

The declarations of our opponents demand a still closer scrutiny, since their victory now would give them the great responsibility they have had since required to carry out.

1859 to pun practice their policy. Never, since that date, have they had control at once both of the executive and the legislative departments of the Government'. This year the election of a President clearly carries with it majorities in both houses of Congress.

THE VITAL ISSUES.

It is obvious that, in the common judgment of the people in all parts of the country, the really vital issues which this year divide parties, and demand a popular decision, are those relating to the tariff and the currency. Fortunately both sides have stated their positions on these subjects with directness, simplicity and frankness. The issues thus made

between the rival candidates for the popular offices are specially sharp and distinct.

ATTITUDE OF EACH PARTY ON THE TARIFF.

We favor a Protective tariff, and, when in full power, made the present one. Our opponents favor a tariff for revenue only, and promise the repeal of the present one.

We maintain that the tariff should cover the difference in the cost of the home and foreign product, caused by the difference in the home and foreign wages for the labor employed upon them. Our opponents repudiated the proposition that the American wages should be considered in the matter, and declared instead that a tariff levied for anything but revenue only was unconstitutional. As "The London Times" of September 23 very naturally remarked, "This policy, if fairly and logically carried out, is not to be distinguished from Free Trade in the practical form in which we are familiar with it."

... If protective duties are unconstitutional, as was asserted at Chicago, no financial legerdemain can pro-

Should the American people now choose the Republican candidates, the present tariff would stand, or, when amended, would only be so changed as to insure a closer conformity in practice to the principles on which it was made. If our opponents should be chosen, their Congress is pledged to the repeal of the present tariff and to the adoption of one arranged for

We maintain that the present tariff has worked well; that it has developed American manufactures, steadily increased American wages and promoted the general prosperity. Our opponents deny that it has brought about any increase of prosperity under the present tariff, declare that wages have been reduced and denounce the Republican policy which, as they

We favor the system by which, when we think the country ready for the reduction or abolition of duties, we insist upon getting corresponding and reciprocal advantages from foreign countries as the condition of their enjoying these advantages in our own markets. Our opponents denounce this reciprocity as a sham, and therefore inferentially pledge themselves to its repeal.

The sharp issues thus presented for the decision of the American people cover more comprehensively

and more specifically than ever a range of considerations relating to a Protective tariff—its constitutionality, its expediency, its relation to wages, its practical workings and the question whether, as it is from time to time reduced, we should throw away the advantages thus extended to foreign nations or should get something in return for them.

A PROTECTIVE TARIFF NOT UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

The constitutionality of a protective tariff has heretofore been thought established. A tariff bill avowedly

"facture" was carried through the 1st Congress by James Madison and was signed by George Washington. A third of a century later, Andrew Jackson, in a message to Congress (December 7, 1850), maintaining the constitutionality of the protective system, said: "In this conclusion I am confirmed as well by the opinions of Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Monroe, who have each repeatedly recommended the exercise of this right under the Constitution, as by the uniform practice of Congress, the continued

ing of the people." To this testimony from the men who made the Constitution, and from the father of the modern Democratic party, may be added that of the latest high authority of that party on constitutional law, the Hon. George Ticknor Curtis, who has recently said: "In common with many other Democrats, I cannot subscribe to the doctrine that a Pro-

...voting for this resolution, the members either showed dense ignorance of American political history or they manifested a purpose to win votes by deceiving the voters. I cannot, at the bidding of these gentlemen, unlearn the lessons of my whole life. . . . If I cannot claim to be an authority on such subjects, I can point out to others the true sources from which to derive interpretations of the Constitution. . . . They are to be found in the interpretations given by the 1st Congress, by Washington's Administration, and by the

Quincy Adams and Jackson."

**MAGNIFICENT RESULTS UNDER A PROTECTIVE
TARIFF.**

The expediency of a Protective tariff has been vindicated by the experience of the past thirty years—the most wonderful period of financial success over untold difficulties in the record of modern civilization.

hou. Under it and by its aid the Republican management of our finances has resulted in the largest payment of a National debt in the shortest time known to history, and in the simultaneous development of the industries of the country and the prosperity of the people on a scale without a parallel. Eight years ago, in a masterly public paper, James G. Blaine called attention to the revelations of the United States census as to the net results of the labor and savings of the American people under the system of a Protective tariff. The "great value" of all the property in the

United States, excluding slaves, was set down in the census of 1860 at fourteen thousand millions of dollars—that being what there was to show for the toll of